



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/830,092	06/27/2001	Kazutaka Shibata	ROH-037	1091

7590 06/15/2004
Mr. Steven M. Rabin
c/o RABIN & BERDO, P.C.
1101 14th Street, NW
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20005

EXAMINER

SONG, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1765

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/830,092

Applicant(s)

SHIBATA, KAZUTAKA

Examiner

Matthew J Song

Art Unit

1765

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3, 4, 6, 10, 12 and 17-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3, 4, 6, 10, 12 and 17-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 10, 12, and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekine et al (WO99/09595), where US 6,495,914 is used as an accurate translation, in view of Applicants admitted prior art (Admission) or Frye et al (US 5,898,223).

Sekine et al discloses bare chip devices **47** each including a plurality of semiconductor devices or IC chips with metal bumps **46** provided on the electrodes are placed and bonded on a base substrate **41** this reads on applicant's chip bonding step. Sekine et al also discloses connection posts (projections) **42** connected to electrodes **44** formed by etching, this reads on applicant's electrode forming step. Sekine et al also discloses epoxy resin **48** is filled in the recesses on the base substrate and coated over the projections and bare chip devices. The epoxy resin is flattened in its surface by grinding or polishing so that the connection posts **42**, and the metal bumps on the bare chip devices can be exposed, this reads on applicant's resin sealing step. Sekine et al also discloses the base substrate with module structures is cut along the centers between the adjacent surrounding walls into individual multi-chip module structures, this reads on applicant's cutting step ('914 col 9, ln 1-55 and Figs 4a-4d). Sekine et al also discloses

Sekine et al discloses a bare chip device 47, including a plurality of semiconductor devices or IC chips bonded on a base substrate 41. Sekine et al also discloses projections 42 and electrodes 44, this reads on applicant's projection electrodes, and an epoxy resin coated over the projections and chips ('914 col 6, ln 5-40). Sekine et al does not disclose a first and second semiconductor chip, such that the first and second semiconductor chip defines a chip-on-chip structure.

In applicants admitted prior art, Admission teaches one of the structures capable of heightening the substantial integration density of a semiconductor device is a chip-on-chip structure. Admission also teaches in a semiconductor device having a chip-on-chip structure, a secondary ship is bonded face-down onto the surface of a primary chip and external connection electrodes are provided on the back side of the primary chip. Admission also teaches such a chip-on-chip structure is advantageous to obtain a high integration density of the elements (page 4 of specification and Fig 19). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Sekine et al's chip device by using the chip-on-chip structure taught by Admission to obtain a high integration density of the elements.

In a method of making a chip-on-chip package, Frye et al teaches conventional chip-on-chip assemblies with chips supported by a chip having interconnection circuits on a support chip and bonding the chips with a solder bump (Fig 2 and col 3, 1-67). Frye et al also teaches chip on chip arrangements offer the advantage of utilizing the surface area of the support chip for interconnection routing (col 3, ln 15-25 and col 3, ln 45-50). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Sekine et al's chip device

by using the chip-on-chip structure taught by Frye et al to utilize the surface area of the chip more effectively (col 3, ln 45-50).

Referring to claim 12, Sekine et al and Admission or Sekine et al and Frye et al teaches a plurality of chips and the semiconductor chip is bonded face down onto the solid device with an active surface of the semiconductor chip opposed to the solid device and substrate ('914 Figs 4a-4d).

Referring to claims 18-19, Sekine et al and Admission or Sekine et al and Frye et al teaches grinding the resin to expose the chip devices and projections ('914 col 6, ln 20-30), this reads on applicant's removing a surface layer section of the resin.

Referring to claim 20, Sekine et al and Admission or Sekine et al and Frye et al teaches the rear side of the multi-chip module structure is ground by grinding prior to the cutting step (col 6, ln 35-45).

Referring to claim 21, Sekine et al and Admission or Sekine et al and Frye et al teaches the projection electrodes 42 are formed with a height such that the top end of each projection electrode is between the height of the active surface of the chip and a height of an inactive surface of the chip (Figs 4a-4d).

3. Claims 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Egawa (JP 08-236692), where an English abstract and an English Computer translation (CT) have been provided, in view of Applicants admitted prior art (Admission) or Frye et al (US 5,898,223).

Egawa discloses a hybrid integrated circuit device, this reads on applicant's solid device, a semiconductor chip 16, 17 bonded onto a surface of the solid device, projection electrodes for

Art Unit: 1765

external connection formed on the surface of the solid device **15**, and a protective resin layer **18,19** for sealing the surface of the solid device with head portions of the projection electrodes thereon exposed.

Egawa does not disclose a first and second semiconductor chip, such that the first and second semiconductor chip defines a chip-on-chip structure.

In applicants admitted prior art, Admission teaches one of the structures capable of heightening the substantial integration density of a semiconductor device is a chip-on-chip structure. Admission also teaches in a semiconductor device having a chip-on-chip structure, a secondary ship is bonded face-down onto the surface of a primary chip and external connection electrodes are provided on the back side of the primary chip. Admission also teaches such a chip-on-chip structure is advantageous to obtain a high integration density of the elements (page 4 of specification and Fig 19). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Egawa's chip device by using the chip-on-chip structure taught by Admission to obtain a high integration density of the elements.

In a method of making a chip-on-chip package, Frye et al teaches conventional chip-on-chip assemblies with chips supported by a chip having interconnection circuits on a support chip and bonding the chips with a solder bump (Fig 2 and col 3, 1-67). Frye et al also teaches chip on chip arrangements offer the advantage of utilizing the surface area of the support chip for interconnection routing (col 3, ln 15-25 and col 3, ln 45-50). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Sekine et al's chip device by using the chip-on-chip structure taught by Frye et al to utilize the surface area of the chip more effectively (col 3, ln 45-50).

Referring to claim 12, the combination of Egawa and Admission or the combination of Egawa and Frye et al teaches the semiconductor chip is bonded face down onto the solid device with an active surface of the semiconductor chip opposed to the solid device and substrate (Figs 1-4 of Egawa and Fig 19 of Admission and Fig 2 of Frye et al).

4. Claims 3, 4, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekine et al (WO99/09595), where US 6,495,914 is used as an accurate translation and an accurate translation can be provided upon request, in view of Fukasawa et al (US 6,455,920) and Ichikawa (JP 02-031437), where an English Abstract has been provided and an accurate translation can be provided upon request.

Sekine et al discloses all of the limitations of claim 3, as discussed previously, except a step for forming a back side resin layer on a back side of the semiconductor substrate and removing a back side resin through polishing or grinding from the semiconductor substrate.

In a method of forming a semiconductor device, Fukasawa et al teaches a semiconductor device **20A** with a resin layer **41** provided on the rear surface of the semiconductor chip. Fukasawa et al teaches the semiconductor chip is improved and problem damages in the bottom surface of the chip at the time of dicing the semiconductor wafer **51** into individual chips is eliminated (col 17, ln 35 to col 18, ln 67 and Figs 23-26). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify to modify Sekine et al with Fukasawa et al's resin layer on the bottom of the chip to eliminate damage to the bottom of the semiconductor chip during dicing.

The combination of Sekine et al and Fukasawa et al does not teach a back side grinding step of thinning the semiconductor substrate by removing the back side resin through polishing or grinding, from the semiconductor substrate.

In a method of packing a semiconductor chip, Ichikawa teaches a semiconductor chip is sealed in resin 21 and the rear side of the chip is subjected to grinding for a reduction in the packaging height. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify to modify the combination of Sekine et al and Fukasawa et al with Ichikawa's grinding of a resin layer to reduce the height and enhance the packaging density.

Referring to claim 3, the combination of Sekine et al, Fukasawa et al and Ichikawa teaches a step of forming a surface resin layer 48 ('914), a back side resin layer 41 ('920) and a back side grinding step ('437) and further polishing the back side of the semiconductor ('914 col 6, ln 35-40). It is also noted that further polishing is not patentable because splitting of one step into two, where the processes are substantially identical or equivalent in terms of function, manner and result was held to be not patentably distinguish the processes (Ex Parte Rubin 128 USPQ 159). The combination of Sekine et al, Fukasawa et al and Ichikawa teaches forming projections 43 ('914). The combination of Sekine et al, Fukasawa et al and Ichikawa teaches grinding or polishing ('914 col 6, ln 20-30).

The combination of Sekine et al, Fukasawa et al and Ichikawa is silent to the order of processing steps. The transposition of process steps where the processes are substantially identical or equivalent in terms of function, manner and result was held to be not patentably distinguish the processes (Ex Parte Rubin 128 USPQ 159).

The combination of Sekine et al, Fukasawa et al and Ichikawa is silent to the surface resin and the backside resin are substantially the same thickness. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Sekine et al, Fukasawa et al and Ichikawa by optimizing the thickness of the resin layer by conducting routine experimentation to obtain same.

Referring to claim 4, the combination of Sekine et al, Fukasawa et al and Ichikawa teaches cutting the substrate after grinding ('914, col 6, ln 30-45).

Referring to claim 6, the combination of Sekine et al, Fukasawa et al and Ichikawa the projections are embedded in the resin layer ('914 col 6, ln 5-40 and Figs 4a-4d).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10, 12, and 17-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

6. Applicant's arguments filed 4/5/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' argument that the cited references does not teach a surface grinding step is performed before a back side grinding step is noted but is not found persuasive. The Examiner admitted that the prior art does not teach the sequence of steps. However, the Examiner maintains the transposition of process steps where the processes are substantially identical or equivalent in terms of function, manner and result is held to not be patentably distinguishing the processes. The applicants allege an advantage is described at lines 15-18 on page 13 of the specification, however there is no discussion of polishing at the cited portion of the specification.

Art Unit: 1765

On page 30 of the specification, there is discussion of a preference of performing the surface grinding step first. However, the specification also states that the surface-grinding step may be performed after the backside grinding step, note page 30, ln 11-15 and each of the protective resin layer and back side of the wafer can be ground uniformly in any portion of the wafer by forming a back side resin layer (page 29, ln 10-25). Therefore, applicants' specification merely teaches a preference of order without demonstrating an unexpected result and the instant specification also teaches the sequence of the steps is not critical because the steps can be interchanged. Furthermore, applicants state in the current response that the wafer **may** be warped if the backside grinding step is performed first (page 10, lines 9-10). A persuasive argument cannot be made for something which may or may not occur because it is also likely warping may not occur even if the backside is polished first.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., making the thickness of the front side protective resin layer uniform throughout the wafer, the heights of the plurality of projection electrodes can be made uniform (pg 11)) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 1765

Takebashi et al (JP 59-092536) teaches applying a resin to a substrate and polishing (Abstract).

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J Song whose telephone number is 571-272-1468. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on 571-272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1765

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Matthew J Song
Examiner
Art Unit 1765

MJS

NADINE G. NORTON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
